

**REMARKS****I. Introduction**

Claims 1-38 are pending in the above application.

Claims 1-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 1, 25 and 38 are independent claims.

**II. Amendments**

Claims 1, 25 and 38 have been amended to more particularly and distinctly claim that which Applicant regards as the invention therein.

**III. Prior Art Rejections**

Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14, 15, 20-35 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kobayashi (U.S. Pub. 2001/0004361).

Claims 16-19 and 36-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of Moon (U.S. Pat. 5,904,038).

Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Fulton*, 391 F.3d 1195, 1199-02 (Fed. Cir. 2004). *Ecolochem Inc. v. Southern California Edison Co.*, 227 F.3rd 1361, 56 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1065 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 999, 50 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 U.S.P.Q.2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992); and *In re*

*Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). See also MPEP 2143.01, 2143.03 (“To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art”) (citations omitted).

As explained in Applicant’s prior response filed on March 24, 2006, incorporated herein, neither Kobayashi nor Moon, taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest connecting a plurality of devices which have a common telephone number and which are connected to a network, by: looking up the telephone number in a table that associates the telephone number with a plurality of devices having unique addresses; establishing a connection with a first one of said devices; establishing a bridge between the first device and a second device, the second device having a different address than the first device and a common telephone number with the first device, whereby the common telephone number enables the first device and the second device to connect to a communication with another device without further connections, as substantially required by amended claims 1, 25 and 38.

Kobayashi does not disclose a plurality of devices which have the same telephone number and different addresses. In fact, Kobayashi clearly states that the phones on its disclosed system have different telephone numbers, not the same telephone number. Kobayashi clearly states “the control circuit 110 associates the private IP address allocated to the telephone 200 with the ID, extension telephone number and user name.” Kobayashi, ¶ [0027]. Figure 2 of Kobayashi also clearly illustrates different extension numbers for devices 1 and 2.

In the Advisory action, the Examiner asserts that:

Kobayashi discloses assigning “extension telephone number” to each telephone, see figures 204 and paragraph 0027 for assigning address to the telephone. It is

well known in the art that “extension telephone number” always associated with a common telephone number, where each of the plurality of telephone, in the telecommunication network, having a common telephone number and unique extension telephone number. Advisory, pg. 2.

As understood, the Examiner appears to rely on a main PBX number as the common telephone number. However, using a main PBX (switchboard) number, requires additional switching connections to reach any single device. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the above claims to clarify that the common telephone number enables the first device and the second device to connect to a communication with another device without further connections.

As explained in Applicant’s prior response, previously incorporated, Kobayashi also does not establish a bridge between a first device and a second device. To the extent that the Examiner’s direction to paragraph 0040 of Kobayashi is intended to respond to this failure of Kobayashi, at best, paragraph 0040 merely uses conventional techniques of simply calling the second number of the second device, i.e. the extension number of the second device.

Finally, as also explained in Applicant’s previous response, Moon also does not disclose or suggest connecting a plurality of devices which have a common telephone number by establishing a bridge between the first device and a second device, the second device having a different address than the first device and a common telephone number with the first device.

Hence, as neither Kobayashi nor Moon, disclose or suggest all of the limitations of any of independent claims 1, 25 or 38, the combination of Kobayashi and Moon does not render these claims unpatentable. Moreover, as claims 2-24 and claims 26-37 depend

on claims 1 and 25, respectively, and incorporate all of the limitations thereof, respectively, the combination of Kobayashi and Moon also does not render these claims unpatentable.

#### IV. Conclusion

Having fully responded to the Office action, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Should any issues arise that prevent early allowance of the above application, the examiner is invited contact the undersigned to resolve such issues.

To the extent an extension of time is needed for consideration of this response, Applicant hereby request such extension and, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account number 502117 for any fees associated therewith.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Larry T. Cullen/  
Larry T. Cullen  
Reg. No.: 44,489

Motorola Connected Home Solutions  
101 Tournament Drive  
Horsham, PA 19044  
(215) 323-1797